

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1-19, 21, 23, 25, 27, and 29-41 were pending prior to the Office Action. No claims have been added through this reply. Claim 41 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter included therein. Therefore, claims 1-19, 21, 23, 25, 27, and 29-40 are pending. Claims 1-2, 5, 6, 9-10, 19, and 21 are independent. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the remarks presented herein, and earnestly seeks a timely allowance of all pending claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate that claims 1-12, 14-15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, and 29-40 are indicated as allowed.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected dependent claims 13, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, asserting that they are allegedly indefinite.

Regarding dependent claim 13, the Examiner asserts that the expression “the transmission circuit device is laid out so that a part or entire of the first block circuit from is formed as one circuit group different from a circuit group in which the first transmission active circuit” is unclear.

Applicants have corrected the typographic error in dependent claim 13. Applicants have amended dependent claim 13 to recite “the transmission circuit device is laid out so that a part or entire of the first block circuit ~~from~~ is formed as one circuit group different from a circuit group in which the first transmission active circuit is formed.” Based on the Examiner’s prior consideration of all the claims (*i.e.*, dependent claims 14-15), it was clear that this error was merely typographical in nature and the intended meaning and scope was clear. Therefore,

Applicants traverse this rejection because the Examiner should have made an objection to claim 13 instead of an indefinite rejection based on her current understanding and consideration of all the claims.

Regarding dependent claims 16 and 18, the Examiner asserts that the expression “the plurality of transmission active circuits” lacks sufficient antecedent basis as recited in the dependent claims 16 and 18.

Applicants have corrected the typographic error in dependent claims 16 and 18. Applicants have amended dependent claims 16 and 18 to recite “the plurality of active circuits further includes a second reception active circuit at a following stage of the reception active circuit block.” Therefore, the rejections to dependent claims 16 and 18 are overcome and should be withdrawn. Further, Applicants traverse this rejection because the Examiner should have made an objection to claims 16 and 18 based on such a minor typographical error instead of alleging an indefinite rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments provide the necessary clarity and definiteness that the Examiner has requested. The amendments do not add new matter. Thus, based on these amendments, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully request that the pending application be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the pending application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the pending application be allowed.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Aslan Ettehadieh Reg. No. 62,278

Application No. 10/829,236
Amendment dated July 13, 2009
After Final Office Action of May 14, 2009

Docket No.: 1248-0717PUS1

at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 13, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant